

The Times-Dispatch

DAILY - WEEKLY - SUNDAY.
 Business Office: 115 E. Main Street
 Richmond, Va.
 Petersburg Bureau: 110 N. Sycamore Street
 Lynchburg Bureau: 115 E. Eighth Street

By MAIL. One Six Three One
 POSTAGE PAID. Year. Mos. Mo. Mo.
 Daily with Sunday: \$4.00 \$2.00 \$1.50
 Daily without Sunday: 4.00 2.00 1.50
 Sunday edition only: 2.00 1.00 .50
 Weekly (Wednesday): 1.00 .50 .25

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg—

One Week
 Daily with Sunday: 10 cents
 Daily without Sunday: 10 cents
 Sunday only: 6 cents

Entered January 27, 1907, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 2, 1879.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1910.

WATCH THE SOUTH GROW.

In his Labor Day speech at St. Paul, Mr. Taft explained his position on the anti-trust law as it applies to farmers and workmen, saying that the rules which are applicable to the railroads as to the making of rates do not apply to farmers or workmen or individuals generally; that all that is required of them is that they shall not violate the general law applying to all persons; that the farmers and workmen "have a right to charge what they choose for what they sell, whether it be products of the farm or labor of their hands." The only thing they have to guard against is violation of the anti-trust law "that prevents them and all others from going into conspiracy to raise the price of products," etc., etc.

There has recently been considerable talk about the so-called cotton pool, which is blamed for the high price of the staple, and proceedings have been instituted by the Department of Justice against a handful of wicked men, who are charged with the crime of keeping up the price of raw cotton, so that the cotton manufacturers have not been able to make as large dividends as formerly; but as Mr. Taft said in another application of the subject, we think that "so great is the general public interest in the promotion of agriculture that it cannot be termed unduly privileged or objectionable" that any sort of pool should have been instrumental in obtaining for the cotton-growers something like the value of the product of their fields. It is one of the strange things about the course of the law in this case that there never was the least movement on the part of the Federal authorities to break up the bears when they were hammering down the price of cotton, and that they should now be so persistently active when the bulls seem to have a little the best of the market.

However that may be, the report of Hester, of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, shows that the farmers have had a fairly good year. Last year the money value of the Southern cotton crop was \$778,894,000. Notwithstanding \$216,000 bales loss were marketed than during the preceding year, the value of the crop was \$95,100,000 more. Counting the value of the cotton seed, the value of the cotton crop during the last cotton year was \$992,894,000, a gain over 1908-1909 of \$127,100,000. More than this, for three years hand-running the cotton mills in the South consumed more cotton than the cotton mills in the North. The mills have come to the cotton. Some of them ought to come to Richmond.

The beauty of the situation is that the South is great and growing more powerful every day in the industrial life of this country and the world because its own people have been in the main faithful to themselves and to their heritage. No new Nationalism for us down this way, if you please. We are just beginning to get fairly started in the race of progress. The safe rule for the people of the South is to plant less cotton for higher prices, make their own supplies in their own fields, follow the advice of Mr. Taft and charge what they choose or what they have to sell, always keeping a careful watch on the thermometer of supply and demand, and they need not worry about the rhapsodies and emotions of impossible men.

SCRATCH THEM ALL.

The Gordonsville Gazette is to be heartily commended for its position on the proposed amendment to the Constitution of Virginia. It advises its constituency: "Just keep it in mind to scratch, scratch off the amendments, and all will be well." This is excellent advice, and it is put so concisely that it will be easy to remember. The Gazette says:

"November 8, 1910, will be election day. It is a most important election. The Gazette means to call the attention of voters to it repeatedly—so often that they will learn enough about the four proposed amendments to our Constitution to vote against every one of them. The politicians and office-holders are the only ones in favor of the amendments, because it will enable them to hold office for life, thus denying opportunities to others equally as deserving. All four of these amendments will work serious injury to the best interests of the taxpayers. They should be voted down overwhelmingly."

The Gazette is right, too. Not only will the adoption of these changes "work serious injury to the best interests of the taxpayers," but they will work with equal damage against good government. No man is entitled to use his office in such a way that he will completely fortify himself against a departure from it. The Gazette expresses the truth when it declares: "The people want these officers changed frequently, and they should scratch off every amendment on next fall's ballot."

The Gazette should keep up this

fight until the election is at hand. One by one, the papers of the Commonwealth are falling into line against these proposed amendments, and they are moulding public sentiment against the changes. Every voter in the fair domain in which the Gazette has its chief circulation ought to read thoughtfully the appeal of our contemporary when it says:

"There are 218 duly qualified voters in Madison District, embracing Gordonsville and Orange Precincts. We desire to urge each and every voter to cast his ballot. There are four amendments to the Constitution to be voted on in the November election. These amendments should be voted down by an overwhelming majority because they mean nothing for the general good and are advocated only by politicians and office-holders."

Every man who opposes these changes ought to vote against them. The other side must not prevail by default of the opponents of the four proposed amendments. Let them be defeated, and defeated overwhelmingly, so that future Legislatures may perceive that no change is to be made in the Constitution unless some substantial good to the whole people is to be worked by its adoption.

THE COLONEL'S PUNCTURED TIRE.
 In his speech at Oswatimie, Kansas, the Colonel, with a courage born of his surroundings, declared for a new Nationalism, saying that while he did not ask for over-centralization, he did ask (he ought to have said "demand") that "we work in a spirit of broad and far-reaching Nationalism when we work for what concerns our people as a whole. We are all Americans. Our common interests are as broad as the continent. I speak to you here in Kansas exactly as I would speak in New York or Georgia; for the most vital problems are those which affect us all alike. The National Government belongs to the whole American people, and where the whole American people are interested, that interest can be guarded effectively only by the National Government. The betterment which we seek must be accomplished, I believe, mainly through the National Government."

How did it happen that, in his speech at the Conservation Congress in St. Paul yesterday the Colonel did not say anything about the necessity of the National Government "taking charge of all the National resources with or without regard to the rights of the States in the premises? What has come over the spirit of his dreams? How come that the new Nationalism was not as "impatient of the utter confusion that results from local Legislatures attempting to treat National issues as local issues" in St. Paul as it was in Oswatimie? What caused the Colonel to change his tune? Did the President's speech on Monday, in which he stood four square to all the winds that blow for the rights of the States, saying "I am firmly convinced that the only safe course for us to pursue is to hold fast to the limitations of the Constitution and to regard as sacred the powers of the States"—did this have anything to do with modifying the rhapsodies of the Colonel at St. Paul? Probably the Colonel has seen a great light and that the sort of speech that would suit Oswatimie and Sioux Falls is not exactly the sort of speech that would be worth while making in New York or St. Paul or in other States and places after the people have been advised against periods that, however eloquent and entertaining, do not shed real light on the subject. We hope that some of the brethren who are good at preserving records have kept tab on the Colonel during his present crazy crusade and that by comparing the Colonel with the Colonel they will be able to make the nation laugh at his "general rhapsodies" and shun his foolish counsel.

A MERE QUESTION OF HAY.

"I" writes from Amelia Court-House that the people of Amelia County are raising hay, and gives this brief but interesting account of what one farmer in that neighborhood has done by intelligent and scientific farming:

"Mr. W. L. Mason, two miles of Mattocum, bought 600 acres of land about three years ago. The land was in broom straw and pines. He has cut and cured this season 150 tons of good hay, and finer corn and tobacco cannot be raised than on this farm. Mr. Mason made this wonderful improvement with acid phosphate, lime and German clover. This farm is no better naturally than hundreds of others in this and adjoining counties, and shows what can be done by proper cultivation and fertilizing."

Yesterday the following communication on a postal card was received from Charlottesville, or so it was postmarked, and it is interesting and valuable in a way, and just to the extent that it will encourage greater activity among the farmers who feed us all:

Just think of it; the grand old State of Virginia can't raise enough hay or grain! No, not half enough to feed the stock used in the State, and that is not all—"the grand old State" can't raise enough vegetables and meat to feed the present good-for-nothing generation of Virginians. Go to any town in the State and enquire about beef, potatoes, cabbage, etc. Quit your bragging. Encourage your dude F. F. V.'s to work; never mind the daddies and granddaddies.

T. M. DABNEY.

That is interesting, as we have said; but it is not conclusive. The "F. F. V.'s" we have met are very nice people, and we have not heard any of them brag about their daddies and granddaddies any more than they deserved; but this is a practical and not a social or a sectional or a political question. It concerns the better cultivation of the soil, the greater diversification of the crops, reduced cost of handling the products of the farms, increased facilities for marketing, adequate home-grown supplies for our domestic needs, and in the adjustment of all these matters there ought to be found some common ground on which both patrician and plebeian could meet and collaborate. Besides, it is just as important in a large sense that the mudball should be fed on good Vir-

ginian-grown food as it is that the "patricians" should have their material wants supplied from the same sources, the kindly earth of this grand old State. Indeed, there are as many of the plain people as there are of the "descendants," and it might be well to encourage them to grow more hay and beef and potatoes and cabbage and things, so that, in the course of time, after they have established another aristocracy in this proud old Commonwealth, they could point their descendants to the improved conditions of country life, to the cattle on a thousand hills, to the horses fed on the forage of Virginia fields, and all this can be done, dear Mr. Dabney, without invidious references to a very good class of other people in the State whose fathers strove for the upbuilding of the State, and strove so well that even to this day their descendants are regarded with much respect. The present question, however, we repeat, is the growing of hay in Virginia for the feeding of the mules of Virginia which entertain no pride of ancestry.

"BEN FESTE BURG."

Martin Luther died in 1516, but he made a lasting impression upon the civilization of the world, and his works live after him. Pheiderer called him "the founder of Protestant civilization," and the Church which he established contains to-day the largest body of Protestant believers in the world, it being estimated that there are 75,000,000 communicant members of this Church. The churches in the United Synod of the South, now in convention in Richmond, have 493,774 communicants, 240 ministers, 451 congregations, and 32,872 Sunday school scholars. Last year the benevolent offerings of the churches in this Synod amounted to \$56,911, and their church property is valued at \$1,714,110. During the period between 1890 and 1906 the Lutheran bodies in this country increased in numerical strength 47.8 per cent.

The United Synod of the South is composed of eight State Synods—North Carolina, Tennessee, South Carolina, Virginia, Southwest Virginia, Georgia, Holston and Mississippi. There are two Lutheran Churches in Richmond, only one of which, however, is affiliated with the Synod of the South. It was organized in 1868, built its first house of worship at Seventh and Grace Streets, is now building a fine edifice on Monument Avenue and has 450 communicants. In the Synod of Virginia there are 6,970 communing Lutherans, and in the Synod of Southwest Virginia there are 9,000 Lutherans.

As a class, the Lutherans are a singularly intelligent and faithful people. They believe what they believe with all their heart. They do not meddle with politics or "conform" to the world in their religious practices or strive for any other purpose than the building up of a spiritual kingdom. They are deeply interested in educational work, and have in this State a most excellent and well-appointed College at Roanoke, which has fashioned many good men for the Church and State. The service of the Church is most impressive because of its grand simplicity, and in the Lutheran ministry there are many of the strongest thinkers and most eloquent preachers in the American pulpit.

A number of interesting questions will be considered at the meeting of the Synod here, among them the establishment of a home for deaconesses, the enlargement of the College in Japan, and the financing of the theological seminary at Columbia, South Carolina. Attention will also be given to the other educational activities of the Church. Many men of great prominence will be in attendance. It is unnecessary to say that the Synod is very welcome to this great town, and that in its deliberations it will have the cordial sympathy of all our people. The more one knows of the Lutherans, the better one likes them.

THE HEAD OF THE MOB.

There was one statement in the speech of Mr. Roosevelt to the National Conservation Congress in St. Paul yesterday which discovered anew the character of the man.

After the conference of the Governors at the White House in May, 1908, and upon the recommendation of the Governors, a National Conservation Commission was appointed by the President for the purpose of giving the Conservation Movement definite form. When the Commission was ready to begin its campaign, Congress declined to make the appropriation asked for the prosecution of its work. The objection to the appropriation was that there were too many commissions. Commenting upon the defeat of this appropriation, Mr. Roosevelt said yesterday:

"When I signed the Sundry Civil Service bill containing this amendment, I transmitted with it as my last official act a memorandum declaring that the amendment was void because it was an unconstitutional interference with the rights of the Executive and that if I were to remain President I would pay to it no attention whatever."

That was characteristic of Mr. Roosevelt. The amendment to the Sundry Civil Service bill provided for the appropriation of a sum of money from the public treasury for the support of the National Conservation Commission. Congress only has the right to appropriate money from the public treasury for any purpose, yet the President informed Congress that he regarded its failure to do what he wanted it to do an unconstitutional interference with the rights of the Executive, and that if he were to remain President he would not pay any attention whatever to its act. That is to say, he would have taken the money for the support of the Conservation Commission with or without permission of law, and now he boasts of his defiant disposition to know no law except the Executive will. In what refreshing contrast with

this threat of Mr. Roosevelt is the statement made by Mr. Taft in his speech at St. Paul on Monday:

"There is an easy way in which the Constitution can be violated by Congress without judicial inhibition, to wit, by appropriations from the National Treasury for unconstitutional purposes. It will be a sorry day for this country if the time ever comes when our fundamental compact shall be habitually disregarded in this matter."

We would not question for a moment Mr. Roosevelt's sincere wish to promote the cause of conservation, but there is a right way and a wrong way, a lawful way and the way of the mob, and Mr. Roosevelt's declaration at the Convention in St. Paul of his deliberate intention to violate the law whenever the law crossed his purposes emphasizes in a most striking way the dangerous character of the man and his utter untrustworthiness in any position of authority. His contempt of law, his disregard of the rights of others, his defiance of orderly precedents discount all his claims of superior patriotism, and the people are finding him out.

THE PEOPLE ARE AWAKING.

Evidence is not wanting that the voters of Virginia are beginning to think about the iniquities of the fee system. Whilst many of them are doubtless not giving a thought to this important subject, there can be no doubt that the day is not distant when they will do so. Reforms are not wrought in a moment. They are achieved slowly. As it is with good roads, so it is with the fee system. The people are being aroused to the necessity for these two great reforms.

Hear a voice from Nottingham: "You deserve the thanks of the people for your editorials on the fee system. You deserve the more thanks because you are the only ones who are antagonizing a very active and influential class. I do not assert that all county officials concerned will be offended at your loyalty to the public good, and I hope that some of them will come and endorse your views, for they must take notice of your position. The fee system, as opposed to a known reasonable salary, has no ground to stand on. Every rational person wants to know and has a right to know what he pays for services, and by the same token, the public has a right to know what the fee system does. There is no room for argument there. Every tendency to establish an official class and to waste money on it should be vigilantly watched and actively opposed by every good citizen, and by the press. Any apathy on the part of the people is our great peril, and the prime cause of all of our ills."

In this condensed statement, this able opponent of the fee system has put the case well. There is no argument for the fee system as against the salary system. "The apathy of the people" we fear far more than we do the activity of the office-holders.

Hear a voice from Southampton, speaking through the esteemed Southampton Democrat:

"The seeming indifference in the recent primary election in our district of the voters not voting will naturally cause our politicians and office-seekers to 'sit up and take notice.'"

"What are the causes? . . . 'Another reason is that many of our voters have decided—and not without cause—that a few registers will carry their own way anyway.'"

"Still another reason is that a clean, honest poor man—he he ever so competent—hardly feels inclined to offer for office and meet the conditions that are required."

It was when the battle cry was "Vote to down the negro." Our people are thinking more than they are voting, but the time is coming when they are going to vote, and we are into the powers that be.

Who are these fee-holders who are organizing to get a lease or extension upon their offices? Why the cry that it is necessary to give some officers several terms that they may equip themselves to perform the duties of their offices? If all recognize the danger of our present system, why do they themselves more than two consecutive terms, why should we want a life tenure of office for our clerks, sheriffs, commissioners and others? We have just as good and competent men who would fill the office of clerk of the court for a stated salary of say \$1,200 to \$2,000 per annum as are those who are now filling these positions.

"Without wishing to pose as a prophet, I predict that many of the aspirants for a seat in the next Legislature will have to define their positions upon the fee system."

"The Rip Van Winkle nap will not last our voters all of the time, and when once aroused there is going to be a mighty awakening in this country."

Yes, there is going to be a "mighty awakening" before long. Next summer, we believe, the people are going to exact from the candidates for the General Assembly a binding and unequivocal declaration as to the fee system. In the next few years, the office-holders who are hugging the fee system are going to have the fight of their lives, and we much mistake the temper of the Virginia people if the office-holders prevail. The day is coming when a "poor man" will feel "inclined to offer for office" and will dare to oppose the office-holders who have built their own personal political machines. The day is coming when our city and county officers shall receive compensation on a salary basis and not on a fee basis. The day is coming when the people will rend the veil of mystery and secrecy that enshrouds the treasures of the office-holders.

"Rip Van Winkle" is not yet awake, but he is tossing in his slumber. He has not much longer to sleep.

TINKERING WITH THE CONSTITUTION.
 The Charlottesville Progress is making a most forceful campaign against the four proposed amendments to the Constitution of Virginia. It brings to battle intimate knowledge of the political history of this Commonwealth and the valuable insight and experi-

ence gained by its editor as a member of the Constitutional Convention which framed our present organic law in 1902. It knows what it is talking about and it does not hesitate to brand each and every one of these proposed changes as unjustifiable and pernicious. The Progress says:

"A gentleman said in our presence recently that it looked to him like presumption in the Legislature for that body to tinker with the Constitution, that it was not selected for that duty, and there was no public demand of any dignity for the attempts that have been made, and are making, to destroy a great deal of the force of that instrument."

That is the position we have taken from the beginning. We do not deny the constitutional right of the General Assembly to propose amendments to the people, but we insist that the originating of such a proposition should be treated not as an ordinary matter by the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth, but as an extraordinary procedure. An amendment to the Constitution is a far more serious matter than the average bill or resolution upon the calendar of the Legislature. Yet there were many bills at the last session of the General Assembly which received ten times more attention than these proposed amendments. It seems to us that they glided too softly through the two houses of the Legislature. Examination of the accounts of the proceedings of that body when they received its ratification two years ago and again this winter reveals the fact that very little was said about them one way or another.

Policies of the most far-reaching importance were considered over many months by the Constitutional Convention of 1902. The members of that body gave deliberation and discussion to these policies that members of the General Assembly in their session of sixty days could not give. The people selected the best available delegates in 1902, with the purpose ever in mind that these representatives should frame an organic law that would stand the test of time and service. The people have elected members of Legislatures subsequently to the Constitutional Convention with no such idea in mind. They sent their delegates to the Constitutional Convention to frame the great structure of our law; they have sent the Legislatures since then to pass such laws as may be necessary to run the machinery of the law, but not to interfere with the framework erected by the Constitution, unless there be some powerful reason for such interference. The Progress well says:

"It can, we think, be said for the Constitutional Convention that the people of Virginia at the time it was called recognized a great need of governmental reform and administrative correction, and simply and directly selected a large majority of the membership with the view of achieving these things. And it is equally certain that after its labors were ended its performance was generally praised by the people, and its members were called upon to realize the good work it had done and who were out of the reach of selfish considerations. Of course, there was a howl in certain quarters that howl has continued to the present day, and the Legislature has given entirely too much complying attention. The outcry was natural. The opportunity for office brokerage and office-holding had been seriously curtailed. In many cases the Legislature has sought to restore the old order of things, and in too many cases they have succeeded in injuring the integrity of an economical public service."

We have faith that the people of this Commonwealth will not take any backward step in this day and time. The progressive policies which their delegates in solemn session wrote into a Constitution in 1902 will receive the ratification of the people in 1910. For when the people refuse to ratify the proposed amendments in November, they will nevertheless be doing an affirmative act in approving the wise policies that are now part and parcel of our fundamental law.

The Sun should have added to its praise of gombo that it is just as good after it has been warmed over to suppress the next day.

Of course, if it had been a murder, or a suicide, or a divorce, the great New York daily newspapers would have run it down long ago; but they desist touch the Tribune. None of them will tell where it stands as between the Colonel and the President. The World ducks like a d-dapper, and the rest of them are scared. They either don't know and don't care, or they are trying to protect "the leading Republican newspaper" from riotous comment, not knowing how soon they may need its friendship at one Court or the other.

Have you ever noticed how brave and devil-may-care some husbands are when the head of the house is not about?

The New York Tribune reported the other day that the Colonel "will feel called on to depart from his prepared speech and denounce in vehement terms the attitude of the Western Governors" towards the theories of Mr. Pinchot and his associates. That is interesting; but what does the Tribune think the Colonel ought to do about it? And what does it think about Mr. Taft? Does it think Mr. Taft should make way for the Colonel? That he is only a tenant at will? That the Colonel is really of more importance than the President?

Menelik, of Abyssinia, is dead, again, and for the fourth or fifth time. He must belong to the cat family. A correspondent writes from Amelia Court-House: "I am much pleased to see what your paper is doing to build up the State, and in calling attention to the proposed amendments to the Constitution." One of the best ways to build up the State is for the people of the State to "live at home," and the only sure way to defeat the amendments is for the people to vote against them.

Polices of the most far-reaching importance were considered over many months by the Constitutional Convention of 1902. The members of that body gave deliberation and discussion to these policies that members of the General Assembly in their session of sixty days could not give. The people selected the best available delegates in 1902, with the purpose ever in mind that these representatives should frame an organic law that would stand the test of time and service. The people have elected members of Legislatures subsequently to the Constitutional Convention with no such idea in mind. They sent their delegates to the Constitutional Convention to frame the great structure of our law; they have sent the Legislatures since then to pass such laws as may be necessary to run the machinery of the law, but not to interfere with the framework erected by the Constitution, unless there be some powerful reason for such interference. The Progress well says:

"It can, we think, be said for the Constitutional Convention that the people of Virginia at the time it was called recognized a great need of governmental reform and administrative correction, and simply and directly selected a large majority of the membership with the view of achieving these things. And it is equally certain that after its labors were ended its performance was generally praised by the people, and its members were called upon to realize the good work it had done and who were out of the reach of selfish considerations. Of course, there was a howl in certain quarters that howl has continued to the present day, and the Legislature has given entirely too much complying attention. The outcry was natural. The opportunity for office brokerage and office-holding had been seriously curtailed. In many cases the Legislature has sought to restore the old order of things, and in too many cases they have succeeded in injuring the integrity of an economical public service."

We have faith that the people of this Commonwealth will not take any backward step in this day and time. The progressive policies which their delegates in solemn session wrote into a Constitution in 1902 will receive the ratification of the people in 1910. For when the people refuse to ratify the proposed amendments in November, they will nevertheless be doing an affirmative act in approving the wise policies that are now part and parcel of our fundamental law.

The Sun should have added to its praise of gombo that it is just as good after it has been warmed over to suppress the next day.

Of course, if it had been a murder, or a suicide, or a divorce, the great New York daily newspapers would have run it down long ago; but they desist touch the Tribune. None of them will tell where it stands as between the Colonel and the President. The World ducks like a d-dapper, and the rest of them are scared. They either don't know and don't care, or they are trying to protect "the leading Republican newspaper" from riotous comment, not knowing how soon they may need its friendship at one Court or the other.

Have you ever noticed how brave and devil-may-care some husbands are when the head of the house is not about?

The New York Tribune reported the other day that the Colonel "will feel called on to depart from his prepared speech and denounce in vehement terms the attitude of the Western Governors" towards the theories of Mr. Pinchot and his associates. That is interesting; but what does the Tribune think the Colonel ought to do about it? And what does it think about Mr. Taft? Does it think Mr. Taft should make way for the Colonel? That he is only a tenant at will? That the Colonel is really of more importance than the President?

Menelik, of Abyssinia, is dead, again, and for the fourth or fifth time. He must belong to the cat family. A correspondent writes from Amelia Court-House: "I am much pleased to see what your paper is doing to build up the State, and in calling attention to the proposed amendments to the Constitution." One of the best ways to build up the State is for the people of the State to "live at home," and the only sure way to defeat the amendments is for the people to vote against them.

Polices of the most far-reaching importance were considered over many months by the Constitutional Convention of 1902. The members of that body gave deliberation and discussion to these policies that members of the General Assembly in their session of sixty days could not give. The people selected the best available delegates in 1902, with the purpose ever in mind that these representatives should frame an organic law that would stand the test of time and service. The people have elected members of Legislatures subsequently to the Constitutional Convention with no such idea in mind. They sent their delegates to the Constitutional Convention to frame the great structure of our law; they have sent the Legislatures since then to pass such laws as may be necessary to run the machinery of the law, but not to interfere with the framework erected by the Constitution, unless there be some powerful reason for such interference. The Progress well says:

"It can, we think, be said for the Constitutional Convention that the people of Virginia at the time it was called recognized a great need of governmental reform and administrative correction, and simply and directly selected a large majority of the membership with the view of achieving these things. And it is equally certain that after its labors were ended its performance was generally praised by the people, and its members were called upon to realize the good work it had done and who were out of the reach of selfish considerations. Of course, there was a howl in certain quarters that howl has continued to the present day, and the Legislature has given entirely too much complying attention. The outcry was natural. The opportunity for office brokerage and office-holding had been seriously curtailed. In many cases the Legislature has sought to restore the old order of things, and in too many cases they have succeeded in injuring the integrity of an economical public service."

We have faith that the people of this Commonwealth will not take any backward step in this day and time. The progressive policies which their delegates in solemn session wrote into a Constitution in 1902 will receive the ratification of the people in 1910. For when the people refuse to ratify the proposed amendments in November, they will nevertheless be doing an affirmative act in approving the wise policies that are now part and parcel of our fundamental law.

The Sun should have added to its praise of gombo that it is just as good after it has been warmed over to suppress the next day.

Of course, if it had been a murder, or a suicide, or a divorce, the great New York daily newspapers would have run it down long ago; but they desist touch the Tribune. None of them will tell where it stands as between the Colonel and the President. The World ducks like a d-dapper, and the rest of them are scared. They either don't know and don't care, or they are trying to protect "the leading Republican newspaper" from riotous comment, not knowing how soon they may need its friendship at one Court or the other.

Have you ever noticed how brave and devil-may-care some husbands are when the head of the house is not about?

The New York Tribune reported the other day that the Colonel "will feel called on to depart from his prepared speech and denounce in vehement terms the attitude of the Western Governors" towards the theories of Mr. Pinchot and his associates. That is interesting; but what does the Tribune think the Colonel ought to do about it? And what does it think about Mr. Taft? Does it think Mr. Taft should make way for the Colonel? That he is only a tenant at will? That the Colonel is really of more importance than the President?

Menelik, of Abyssinia, is dead, again, and for the fourth or fifth time. He must belong to the cat family. A correspondent writes from Amelia Court-House: "I am much pleased to see what your paper is doing to build up the State, and in calling attention to the proposed amendments to the Constitution." One of the best ways to build up the State is for the people of the State to "live at home," and the only sure way to defeat the amendments is for the people to vote against them.

Polices of the most far-reaching importance were considered over many months by the Constitutional Convention of 1902. The members of that body gave deliberation and discussion to these policies that members of the General Assembly in their session of sixty days could not give. The people selected the best available delegates in 1902, with the purpose ever in mind that these representatives should frame an organic law that would stand the test of time and service. The people have elected members of Legislatures subsequently to the Constitutional Convention with no such idea in mind. They sent their delegates to the Constitutional Convention to frame the great structure of our law; they have sent the Legislatures since then to pass such laws as may be necessary to run the machinery of the law, but not to interfere with the framework erected by the Constitution, unless there be some powerful reason for such interference. The Progress well says:

"It can, we think, be said for the Constitutional Convention that the people of Virginia at the time it was called recognized a great need of governmental reform and administrative correction, and simply and directly selected a large majority of the membership with the view of achieving these things. And it is equally certain that after its labors were ended its performance was generally praised by the people, and its members were called upon to realize the good work it had done and who were out of the reach of selfish considerations. Of course, there was a howl in certain quarters that howl has continued to the present day, and the Legislature has given entirely too much complying attention. The outcry was natural. The opportunity for office brokerage and office-holding had been seriously curtailed. In many cases the Legislature has sought to restore the old order of things, and in too many cases they have succeeded in injuring the integrity of an economical public service."

We have faith that the people of this Commonwealth will not take any backward step in this day and time. The progressive policies which their delegates in solemn session wrote into a Constitution in 1902 will receive the ratification of the people in 1910. For when the people refuse to ratify the proposed amendments in November, they will nevertheless be doing an affirmative act in approving the wise policies that are now part and parcel of our fundamental law.

The Sun should have added to its praise of gombo that it is just as good after it has been warmed over to suppress the next day.

Of course, if it had been a murder, or a suicide, or a divorce, the great New York daily newspapers would have run it down long ago; but they desist touch the Tribune. None of them will tell where it stands as between the Colonel and the President. The World ducks like a d-dapper, and the rest of them are scared. They either don't know and don't care, or they are trying to protect "the leading Republican newspaper" from riotous comment, not knowing how soon they may need its friendship at one Court or the other.

Have you ever noticed how brave and devil-may-care some husbands are when the head of the house is not about?

The New York Tribune reported the other day that the Colonel "will feel called on to depart from his prepared speech and denounce in vehement terms the attitude of the Western Governors" towards the theories of Mr. Pinchot and his associates. That is interesting; but what does the Tribune think the Colonel ought to do about it? And what does it think about Mr. Taft? Does it think Mr. Taft should make way for the Colonel? That he is only a tenant at will? That the Colonel is really of more importance than the President?

Menelik, of Abyssinia, is dead, again, and for the fourth or fifth time. He must belong to the cat family. A correspondent writes from Amelia Court-House: "I am much pleased to see what your paper is doing to build up the State, and in calling attention to the proposed amendments to the Constitution." One of the best ways to build up the State is for the people of the State to "live at home," and the only sure way to defeat the amendments is for the people to vote against them.

Polices of the most far-reaching importance were considered over many months by the Constitutional Convention of 1902. The members of that body gave deliberation and discussion to these policies that members of the General Assembly in their session of sixty days could not give. The people selected the best available delegates in 1902, with the purpose ever in mind that these representatives should frame an organic law that would stand the test of time and service. The people have elected members of Legislatures subsequently to the Constitutional Convention with no such idea in mind. They sent their delegates to the Constitutional Convention to frame the great structure of our law; they have sent the Legislatures since then to pass such laws as may be necessary to run the machinery of the law, but not to interfere with the framework erected by the Constitution, unless there be some powerful reason for such interference. The Progress well says:

"It can, we think, be said for the Constitutional Convention that the people of Virginia at the time it was called recognized a great need of governmental reform and administrative correction, and simply and directly selected a large majority of the membership with the view of achieving these things. And it is equally certain that after its labors were ended its performance was generally praised by the people, and its members were called upon to realize the good work it had done and who were out of the reach of selfish considerations. Of course, there was a howl in certain quarters that howl has continued to the present day, and the Legislature has given entirely too much complying attention. The outcry was natural. The opportunity for office brokerage and office-holding